

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3 and 14 have been amended. Applicants believe these amendments to the claims add no new matter to the application and are fully supported by the original disclosure. For example, support for the features “deleting said anchor point each time a session between an access terminal and the network ends” of amended claims 1 and 14 and “delete said anchor point each time a session between an access terminal and the network ends” of amended claim 3 is found on page 10, lines 18 – 23 of the specification.

In the Office Action mailed September 27, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Leung (US PAT 6195705).

Claims 2, 3, 8 – 13, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Moy (OSPF Version 2, Request for Comments: 1583, March 1994).

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Moy (OSPF Version 2, Request for Comments: 1583, March 1994) and further in view of Saleh et al. (6801496).

Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Leung (US PAT 6195705).

On page 2, paragraph 3, the Examiner refers to router/Home Agent HA1 and router/Home Agent HA2 of Leung as anchor points and states that Leung anticipates claim 1. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Home Agents of Leung are not anchor points. “Each dedicated controller 430 functions as an anchor point to the service device(s) 270 to which it is connected.” Page 10, lines 9-11. “Each DC 430 handles the generation of and the reception of capsules associated with the access terminal with which it is associated. Each time a session between an access terminal 110 and a network 120 ends, CC 420 deletes the instance of DC 430. Whenever an instance of DC 430 is deleted, the resources previously allocated to that instance are

deallocated.” Page 10, lines 18 – 23. “The router/Home Agents of Leung are not deleted each time a session between an access terminal 110 and a network 120 ends. Thus, the router/Home Agents of Leung are not anchor points. This point has been clarified in amended claim 1, which has been amended to include the following feature “deleting said anchor point each time a session between an access terminal and the network ends.” Since Leung does not disclose the feature “deleting said anchor point each time a session between an access terminal and the network ends” in amended claims 1 and 14, amended claims 1 and 14 are not anticipated by Leung.

Claims 6 and 15 are allowable because they depend on allowable claims 1 and 14.

On page 3, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 16 stating “Leung teaches changing intervals at which link advertisements are transmitted (column 15, lines 54-56, when an active Mobility Agent stops sending hello messages, the standby Mobility Agent will take over after the hold time expires).” The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. In fact, Leung specifically teaches away from the standby Mobility Agent “changing intervals at which link advertisements are transmitted.” Leung discloses “*All* routers/Mobility Agents in the same group use the *same* hellotime which may be specifically configured by a user.” (emphasis added) See col. 16, lines 16-18 of Leung. Since Leung does not disclose all the features of claims 7 and 16, claims 6 and 15 are not anticipated by Leung. Claims 7 and 16 are also allowable because they depend on allowable claims 1 and 14.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 8 – 13, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Moy (OSPF Version 2, Request for Comments: 1583, March 1994).

The Examiner states on pages 4-5 of the Office Action with respect to claim 3, “wherein advertisements indicate that packets having a destination IP address equal to that of the IP address of said remote terminal should be delivered to said remote terminal (column 11, lines 16-

17, a home address specifying the IP address of the Mobile Node).” The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Col. 11, lines 16-17 of Leung discloses the content of a “registration update message.” See col. 11, line 10 of Leung. The registration update message is used to update the standby router of new registrations. Col. 11, lines 7-8. On the other hand, “Hello messages notify other routers/Mobility Agents in the network that a particular router is operational in the system.” Col. 13, lines 17-19 of Leung. They are not “advertisements [which] indicate that packets having a destination IP address equal to that of the IP address of said remote terminal should be delivered to said remote terminal” as disclosed in claim 3. Therefore, since Leung does not disclose all the features of claim 3, claim 3 is not anticipated by Leung.

In addition, claim 3 is allowable because it has been amended to include the feature “delete said anchor point each time a session between an access terminal and the network ends.” which is found on page 10, lines 18 – 23 of the specification. As stated above with respect to claims 1 and 14, this feature is not disclosed by Leung. Therefore, claim 3 is allowable.

On page 5, the Examiner states with respect to claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18 that “Leung teaches sending an ARP message informing entities that all packets with a destination address of said anchor point may be sent to an address of another anchor point . . .” and cites the ARP request disclosed in column 23, lines 1-10 of Leung. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Leung specifically teaches away from using the limitation found in lines 1-10 of column 23 because “the corresponding node is again susceptible to failure if the standby Home Agent goes down. . . . In this invention, this difficulty is overcome . . . so that the host or corresponding node can never discover a router’s primary MAC address.” Col. 23, lines 11 – 16 of Leung. Thus, Leung teaches away from “sending an ARP message informing entities that all packets with a destination address of said anchor point may be sent to an address of said another anchor point” as disclosed in claim 8, 9, 17 and 18 and “send an ARP message informing entities that all packets with a destination address of said anchor point may be sent to an address of said another anchor point” as disclosed in claims 12 and 13. Therefore, since all the features of claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are not disclosed by Leung, claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are patentable. Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are also patentable because they depend on allowable claims 1, 3, and 14 respectfully.

On page 5, the Examiner states that Leung discloses the features of claims 9, 10, 11, 13 and 18. Claims 9, 13 and 18 are allowable for the reasons stated above. In addition, claims 10, and 11 are allowable because they depend on allowable claim 3 respectfully.

On page 6, the Examiner states that Leung discloses the features of claims 2 and 3. Claim 2 is patentable because it depends on allowable claim 1. As stated above, claim 3 is allowable because it has been amended to include the feature “delete said anchor point each time a session between an access terminal and the network ends” which is found on page 10, lines 18 – 23 of the specification. This feature is not disclosed by Leung or Moy. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over the combination of Leung in view of Moy.

On page 6, with respect to claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18, the Examiner makes reference to “incrementing the advertisement’s age to MaxAge” and states that “Moy in the same field of endeavor teaches setting a first timer [advertisement’s age] representing the maximum amount of time [MaxAge] it should take for a low cost route [network links advertisement] to propagate throughout a network and cites page 71, section 12.4.2, paragraph 4 of Moy. Moy discloses that “The network links advertisement describes *all* the routers that are attached to the network (emphasis added). . . . The networks links advertisement lists those routers that are fully adjacent to the Designated Router . . .” See page 71, section 12.4.2, paragraphs 1 and 2 of Moy. Thus, the advertisement is not “a low cost route” in a network as disclosed in claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18. Instead, it is simply a list of *all* the routers attached to the network. Since going through a list of all routers attached to a network would not appear to be a low cost route, “flushing the network links advertisement by prematurely incrementing the advertisement’s age to MaxAge is not “setting a first timer representing the maximum amount of time it should take for a low cost route to propagate throughout a network” as disclosed in claims 8, 9, 17 and 18, or “set a first timer representing the maximum amount of time it should take for a low cost route to propagate throughout a network” as disclosed in claims 12 and 13. Therefore, since the combination of Leung in view of Moy does not disclose all of the features of these claims, claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 17 and 18 are patentable.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Moy in view of Saleh et al. (6801496).

Claims 4 and 5 are allowable because they depend on allowable claim 3.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 28, 2006

By: 

Larry J. Moskowitz, Reg. No. 42,911
(858) 651-4556

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502